UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/967,167	09/28/2001	Hao-hua Chu	10745/027	4931

				EXAMINER
26529	7590	10/26/2006		RIES, LAURIE ANNE

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN/PDC
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/967,167	CHU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 August 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-53</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) <u>11-20 and 43-53</u> is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3, 7-10, 21-23, 25-34 and 38-42</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>4-6, 24 and 35-37</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 September 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail. Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 18 August 2006,

to the Original Application, filed 28 September 2001.

2.   Claims 1-3, 6-10, 21-23, 25-34, and 37-42 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over "User Interface Markup Language (UIML) Draft

Specification Document Version 17", Harmonia, Inc, hereafter referred to as

"Harmonia") in view of Templeman (U.S. Patent 5,845,303).

3.   Claims 1-53 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 21, 32, 42, 43, and 53 are independent

claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-3, 6-10, 21-23, 25-34, and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over "User Interface Markup Language (UIML) Draft

Specification Document Version 17", Harmonia, Inc, hereafter referred to as

"Harmonia") in view of Templeman (U.S. Patent 5,845,303).

As per independent claims 1, and 21 and dependent claims 2 and 23,

Harmonia discloses a system and method of dynamically adapting a presentation

generated by an application to a display screen of any of a number of different device

platforms including a) providing a number of graphical user interface components in a

hierarchical configuration, the graphical user interface components being platform

independent with respect to the number of heterogeneous device platforms. (See

Harmonia, Page 23, Section 6.4), b) arranging the graphical user interface components

on a page as a function of the hierarchy (See Harmonia, Page 24, Section 6.4.1), and

where b) includes nesting, or identifying graphical user interface components that

represent the lowest hierarchical level and a highest layout priority within the

hierarchical configuration (See Harmonia, Page 24, Section 6.4.1, Paragraph 2).

Harmonia does not disclose expressly c) creating a device platform dependent

presentation by selectively transforming one or more of the graphical user interface

components to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display

screen of one of the different device platforms running the application than filled without

transformation.

Templeman discloses adjusting or transforming the size of a GUI component to

maintain consistent relationships between frames when frame sizes change (See

Templeman, Figure 4, and Column 8, lines 39-48). Templeman further discloses that

metaforms, or GUI components, may be customized for use with a particular display

type or size to optimally utilize available screen space (See Templeman, Column 5, lines 27-29).

Harmonia and Templeman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating graphical user interfaces.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the arrangement and transformation of graphical user interface components of Ikemoto with the method of adapting a presentation to heterogeneous device platforms of Harmonia. The motivation for doing so would have been to optimally utilize the available screen space on a particular output device. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Templeman with Harmonia for the benefit of optimally utilizing the available screen space on a particular output device to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 2, 21, and 23.

As per dependent claim 3, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Templeman also discloses that constraints are defined to allow an object or GUI component to contract, or reduce in size based upon the display device (See Templeman, Column 8, lines 42-44). Harmonia and Templeman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating graphical user interfaces. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the reduction in size of a GUI component based upon the display capacity of Templeman with the method of adapting a presentation to heterogeneous device platforms of Harmonia. The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain consistent relationships between components as the display size of

the display device changes. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Templeman with Harmonia and Templeman for the benefit of maintaining consistent relationships between components as the display size of the display device changes to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

As per dependent claims 7 and 28, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses applying a set of style guide parameters to each of the graphical user interface components to create uniformity in the visual appearance of the graphical user interface components (See Harmonia, Page 25, Section 6.5).

As per dependent claim 8, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Harmonia also discloses arranging the graphical user interface components as a function of properties specified by the application (See Harmonia, Page 25, Section 6.5, paragraph 1).

As per dependent claim 9, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Harmonia also discloses generating a set of proposed device platform specific pages (See Harmonia, Page 10-11, Section 3.1.3) and selecting at least one device platform specific page from the set to display the graphical user interface components with the display screen (See Harmonia, Page 23, Section 6.3, paragraph 1 – Description).

As per dependent claim 10, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Harmonia also discloses sizing each of the proposed device platform specific pages as a function of the graphical user interface components

arranged to form each of the proposed device platform specific pages (See Harmonia,
Page 25, Section 6.5, paragraph 2).

      As per dependent claim 22, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations
of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses that the hierarchical
configuration is an intermediate representation including a number of container nodes,
such as frames, and a number of component nodes, the component nodes representing
the graphical user interface components (See Harmonia, Page 24, Section 6.4.1,
paragraph 3).

      As per dependent claim 25, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations
of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses that the graphical user
interface components include device platform independent graphical user interface
components (See Harmonia, Page 9, Section 3.1).

      As per dependent claims 26 and 27, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the
limitations of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses transforming the
graphical user interface components to graphical user interface components that are
specific to the target device platform and transforming a composite graphical user
interface component including a number of graphical user interface components to a
composite graphical user interface component that is specific to a target device platform
(See Harmonia, Page 24, Section 6.4.1).

      As per dependent claim 29, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations
of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses that the target device platform
includes one of a pager, wireless phone, personal digital assistant, hand-held personal

computer, vehicle navigation system, and notebook personal computer (See Harmonia,

Page 5, Section 1.3, paragraph 4 – "Device").

As per dependent claim 30, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations

of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses that the transformation

module is operable to generate a set of possible device specific pages of various sizes

and select therefrom (See Harmonia, Page 5, Section 1.3, paragraph 7 – "Rendering").

As per dependent claim 31, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations

of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses that the target device platform

includes any one of a number of different device platforms (See Harmonia, Page 5,

Section 1.3, Paragraph 6 – "Platform").

As per independent claim 32, Harmonia discloses an article of manufacture

having one or more recordable media storing instructions thereon which, when

executed by a system, causes the system to dynamically adapt a presentation

generated by an application to a display screen of any of a number of heterogeneous

device platforms according to a method including a) providing a number of graphical

user interface components in a hierarchical configuration, the graphical user interface

components being platform independent with respect to the number of heterogeneous

device platforms (See Harmonia, Page 23, Section 6.4), and b) arranging the graphical

user interface components on a page as a function of the hierarchy (See Harmonia,

Page 24, Section 6.4.1).

Harmonia does not disclose expressly c) creating a device platform dependent

presentation by selectively transforming one or more of the graphical user interface

components to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display

screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application then filled

without transformation.

Templeman discloses adjusting or transforming the size of a GUI component to

maintain consistent relationships between frames when frame sizes change (See

Templeman, Figure 4, and Column 8, lines 39-48). Templeman further discloses that

metaforms, or GUI components, may be customized for use with a particular display

type or size to optimally utilize available screen space (See Templeman, Column 5,

lines 27-29).

Harmonia and Templeman are analogous art because they are from the same

field of endeavor of creating graphical user interfaces.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to combine the arrangement and transformation of graphical user

interface components of Ikemoto with the method of adapting a presentation to

heterogeneous device platforms of Harmonia. The motivation for doing so would have

been to optimally utilize the available screen space on a particular output device.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Templeman with Harmonia for the

benefit of optimally utilizing the available screen space on a particular output device to

obtain the invention as specified in claim 32.

As per dependent claim 33, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations

of claim 32 as described above. Harmonia also discloses nesting, or identifying

graphical user interface components representative of the lowest hierarchical level and

a highest layout priority within the hierarchical configuration (See Harmonia, Page 24,

Section 6.4.1, paragraph 2).

As per dependent claim 34, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations

of claim 32 as described above. Templeman also discloses that constraints are defined

to allow an object or GUI component to contract, or reduce in size based upon the

display device (See Templeman, Column 8, lines 42-44). Harmonia and Templeman

are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating

graphical user interfaces. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the reduction in size of a GUI component

based upon the display capacity of Templeman with the method of adapting a

presentation to heterogeneous device platforms of Harmonia. The motivation for doing

so would have been to maintain consistent relationships between components as the

display size of the display device changes. Therefore it would have been obvious to

combine Templeman with Harmonia and Templeman for the benefit of maintaining

consistent relationships between components as the display size of the display device

changes to obtain the invention as specified in claim 34.

As per dependent claim 38, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations

of claim 32 as described above. Harmonia also discloses applying a set of style guide

parameters to each of the graphical user interface components to create uniformity in

the visual appearance of the graphical user interface components (See Harmonia, Page

25, Section 6.5).

As per dependent claim 39, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations

of claim 32 as described above. Harmonia also discloses arranging the graphical user

interface components as a function of properties specified by the application (See

Harmonia, Page 25, Section 6.5, paragraph 1).

As per dependent claim 40, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations

of claim 32 as described above. Harmonia also discloses generating a set of proposed

device platform specific pages (See Harmonia, Page 10-11, Section 3.1.3), and

selecting at least one device platform specific page from the set to display the graphical

user interface components with the display screen (See Harmonia, Page 23, Section

6.3, paragraph 1 – "Description").

As per dependent claim 41, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations

of claim 40 as described above. Harmonia also discloses sizing each of the proposed

device platform specific pages as a function of the graphical user interface components

arranged to form each of the proposed device platform specific pages (See Harmonia,

Page 25, Section 6.5, paragraph 2).

Independent Claim 42 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 18 August 2006 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on Pages 16-20 of the Instant Amendment that Harmonia in combination with Templeman fails to teach creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. The Office respectfully disagrees. Templeman teaches that metaforms, or GUI components, may be customized for user with a particular display type or size to optimally utilize available screen size. As shown in Templeman, Figure 4, the size of the GUI components may be increased, thus adjusting the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of the display screen (see Templeman, Figure 4, showing that the GUI objects have the ability to expand in size. See also Templeman, Column 8, lines 42-48 and lines 54-67). Templeman further teaches that the GUI components may be selectively transformed, such as adjusting the size of a particular component to accommodate additional data (See Templeman, Column 8, lines 60-67).

Allowable Subject Matter

6.   Claims 11-20 and 43-53 are allowed.

7.   Claims 4-5, 24, and 35-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

10.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have

questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER